

Galena Aquatic Restoration Project Co-design Meeting #3

Meeting Summary

August 29, 2017, 1200-1500

Work Group Members Present:

Steph Charrette (Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon), John Collins (Landowner), Mark Croghan (Bureau of Reclamation), Shaun Doyle (Mine Claimant), Althea Gibbs (Landowner), Zane Gibbs (Landowner), Billie Jo George (Landowner), Kirk Handley (Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife), Judy Kerr (Landowner), Vito Mosso (Landowner), Francis Preston (Landowner), Ben Regalado (Mine Claimant), Matt Rippee (Oregon Parks and Recreation Department), Marcy Rosenberg (Landowner), Justin Rowell (North Fork John Day Watershed Council), Jim Sproul (Landowner)

Facilitators and Presenters:

Vernita Ediger (Facilitator), Bob Hassmiller (Forest Service), Mark McCollister (The Freshwater Trust), Allen Taylor (Forest Service)

Forest Service Technical Support and Advisors:

Kate Cueno, Sasha Fertig, Dave Halemeier, Don Hann, Laurie Montgomery, Hannah Smith

Meeting Overview and Introductions

Greetings by Allen Taylor. Background of project and review of comments. Incorporation of values and suggestions into project design. The purpose of this meeting is to present the draft project design to stakeholders for review and input.

Vernita: greetings. We are here today to bring some closure to the three-meeting series. Anybody new? (There are three new people.) Thanks for coming. Glad to have you here.

As Allen said, we started this project with a lofty goal of soliciting input from diverse stakeholders and integrating your values in the project design. During meeting 1 we learned about project, and heard questions and concerns. After that, Allen and Bob answered those questions. For meeting 2, we dialed in deeper and learned what might be done for restoration, and where it might be done. Then we spent some time listening, and learning about specific areas of concern to you. Between this meeting and the previous meeting, an engineering team was selected (no team was selected previously), all of the project needs and stakeholder input was given over, and the engineering team produced a first preliminary draft last week. Bob and Allen addressed some concerns, and got the newest version back yesterday afternoon. Wanted to share it with folks before this meeting, but that didn't work out. Will be able to send it home with you to review in depth.

Vernita: This meeting is where the rubber hits the road. Today we'll be taking a look at this draft design. The Forest Service is coming back to you saying "Hey, we listened to you" and hopefully you see your concerns and values reflected in this design.

Review of some of those values (displayed on the wall). Some concerns included flooding, aesthetics, water movement, fish habitat, wildlife, ecological processes, and indigenous treaty rights. Public lands management means taking into account the scope of values and doing our best to work together. I greatly appreciate everyone's time and effort in this process, and the Forest Service team's willing to work with the public and incorporate their values.

Today we will see how the design team has integrated your input into the design—remembering that we are looking for a shared solution and that shared solution may involve some compromise on everyone's part.

Reminder about working agreements (i.e., being respectful, not cutting people off, no side conversations, asking questions, etc.)

Introductions around the room.

Overview and agenda review.

Discussed finding a shared solution and what that might look like. Taking all the values and concerns that people express and creating a product from that can be a challenge. This is a restoration project; it should focus on those key components of restoration. There were also scoping concerns – aesthetic concerns and history. Concerns about risk of property damage, flooding. This design attempts to balance these interests, while using a common sense approach.

Project Design

Bob Hassmiller and Allen Taylor presenting design (slide show presentation).

Handouts of preliminary design. Set consists of a few overview sheets, then zooms in. Allen and Bob hope they can interpret this for you in the slide show.

Just want to cover a couple of things, somewhat of a repeat from first two meetings. Overall goal is to restore aquatic process and function and recognize historical values. Laws, acts, and Forest Plan are sideboards the Forest Service has to stay within to meet those objectives.

There are stakeholder objectives, and ecological restoration objectives. We came in with some aquatic restoration objectives. Your input helped clarify some of the stakeholder values.

Context: project relative to heritage site.

Jim Sproul: Didn't all of it used to be private?

Marcy Rosenberg/Zane Gibbs: Yes, the Gibbs family owned it.

Allen: Planning team has been focusing on getting input to the design firm and working with them to have the best product they have to share with you, not necessarily building the slide show. Hope we invested our limited time wisely...

Starting with sheet 3 from handout. Tan and yellow marks are culturally significant tailing piles surveyed and identified by heritage folks. A few of those areas we are proposing to alter.

Bob: But there is a transition from heavier aquatic restoration emphasis to more emphasis on preserving historical mine tailing. Gave explanation of shading; light and dark blue. There is additional detail on the sheets (4-8).

Billie Jo George: To me all of the mine tailings are culturally significant. Why are only some identified as such?

Allen: Good question. Heritage surveys came back with areas within that area that were relatively intact preserved tailing piles. Others had been previously leveled off, with some of the equipment left behind.

Zane: That's not what that equipment was for. (Gave explanation) Need to get it out of there before it's removed.

Allen: Don Hann will speak to this more later in the meeting, but suggested that piece of equipment can likely be returned to the Gibbs family. We found information suggesting it was used to level off some of the tailings, since some have been leveled off. But the patches identified as mostly unaltered were identified as key tailing piles for the purposes of mitigation. That doesn't mean the rest of them are inconsequential.

Bob: As we go through we'll talk about which areas we'll regrade and which we won't and why.

Allen: Looking at page 8 now...

Bob: In some sections we want to reduce the width of that low-flow channel. Some are hashmarked; that's where we'd fill in material.

Allen: Green triangle areas are where we would maintain existing vegetation. Don't need to do anything else there. Those areas are doing quite well already.

Bob: Don't need to regrade that area. They are recovering on their own.

Allen: Where the green triangles overlap the grey are proposed regraded floodplain. That is an area the planning team has been talking a lot about. Where we've landed is that is an area where we are going to preserve those tailings and existing vegetation to the max degree possible. If later analysis shows we cannot meet project objectives, we might do selective grading and replanting in those areas.

Vernita: Questions so far? So to recap, areas of hashmarked green we are trying to preserve.

Allen: Yes.

Zane: Have you guys ever seen that river in the spring when it floods? Because I see the way that river is now, and that Galena hotel almost in water. If you narrow that channel, going to have more water upriver to flood.

Bob: Dataset by Bureau of Reclamation who took photographs by helicopter in 2011, during a 50 to 100 year flow event. So we have good pictures of how inundated the area becomes.

Zane: Ice jams up just below Galena.

Bob: Yes, bottlenecking in one area.

Marcy: The three of us have lived there, when that ice went out. It jams up. Has nothing to do with the tailings. Has everything to do with the ice piling up. Water goes where it wants to. It comes right straight through Galena.

Not only that, but down below there see ice jams. Floods that whole place.

Vernita: Sounds like you are concerned about the analysis. Is it really the pinch point, or is the ice jamming the channel?

Zane: Are you planning on raising the water table?

Bob: No, not through this reach. This is the area where we heard stakeholder values, and creating more of an inset floodplain. Want to lower that floodplain.

Allen: That would make more room for the ice.

Zane: Where are you going to elevate it? Going to wash the roads out. That county road is lower than the rest of it.

Bob: In the design, they created a berm to protect the county road. The engineers looked at the model for areas where it posed a concern, and added berms there.

Billie Jo: The point you guys are missing is that the flood in 2011 was small. Not 100 year flood. Small in comparison for potential to come though there. Need to plan for that. 2011 was nothing compared to what some of us have come down though there. Year of '64, for example.

Allen: The engineers will take this design through a series of iterations. At some point they will certify that the project won't increase potential of flooding.

Billie Jo: Models aren't true science. Don't necessarily predict what will happen.

Vernita: There is a lot that goes into modeling. Let's come back and address concerns about that a little later and focus more conceptually on how this design addresses concerns about flooding.

Francis Preston: Can you show us what you plan to do to mitigate the flooding

Allen: Narrow the channel and reconnect floodplain downstream of Galena starting near Deep Creek confluence.

Zane: That's what causes the ice jams.

Bob: As we go through the different design sheets will hopefully be able to see what's being done to protect the town of Galena.

Zane: Elevation points on the map?

Vernita: What I want to highlight with regard to process here, heard the Forest Service make a commitment that the project will address flooding issues, will not cause additional flooding. A lot of concerns with this. Will there be another chance to have this discussion in further detail?

Francis: You mentioned berms for the roadside; does that mean there is already going to be flooding with this plan?

Allen: There is already flooding. This will address that.

Francis: Do you anticipate increase in water going the other way?

Bob: No, I think it's the opposite. Channels that have connected floodplains store that water and would reduce the amount going downstream.

Jim: From one end of that stream to the other, there is 8 feet of elevation. That is not much.

Bob: That's the berm depicted. We could be going across the berm at that high point.

Kirk Handley: So it's not going over that point. Is that the proposed elevation profile?

Bob: No, that's existing.

Billie Jo: Where is Bear Creek? Thought the object of the project is to fix Bear Creek.

Vernita: There was a whole suite of restoration. Bear Creek was one of the pieces in that process, but there were other components as well.

Mark Croghan: Talking about narrowing; should instead talk about floodplain connectivity. Water elevation gets reduced. For ice jams, we have a wider area for it to be distributed.

Zane: But if they narrow that channel it's going to back up into Galena.

Allen: In this reach, we wanted to preserve the culturally significant mine tailing patch. Newly created channel would carve across a small portion of it. That's where we would transition to a better connected floodplain, a ways downstream of Galena.

Steph Charette: Jump to page 10.

Bob: Yes, next we're going to look at channels of the floodplain and what that would look like. Preserving the existing vegetation.

Mark McCollister: Will look like it does now just below Galena?

Steph: Habitat wood just to the left, going to deepen that?

Bob: Would create a larger floodplain area through there, which would potentially mitigate the flooding.

Marcy: Existing comes down, and you're proposing turning it?

Bob: No, it would continue straight.

Allen: Not proposing doing anything through there. Going to have water flowing in sidechannels before it goes out to the entire floodplain.

Bob: Water is more permeable through the substrate and would go through the ground and into the alcoves as cooler water. You will see a lot of these proposed alcoves being constructed as we go.

Vernita: So what I hear is that the FS was prioritizing preserving the aesthetics around Galena—which was a value listed in Scoping and that we have discussed at length. As a result, this design opts to do minimal work in that area, so that people could still see a lot of the same things as they see now. Concerns are with how is this going to work out with flooding and ice jams.

Dave Halemeier: This is a great example of compromise. Two issues that we're struggling with regarding visual preservation of tailings versus flooding. A compromise might be taking out more of those tailings visual elements to provide for connected floodplain in order to mitigate ice jams.

Jim: That area has been there since '50s. Flood of '64 did not take town away. Need to be careful when changing area.

Marcy: Someone is going to be helping me bail my house out.

Jim: Multiple channels are basically flood irrigation. Private landowners do that in the spring. Don't need to do that all year long. If you do have a high water event and that clogs up, then you have a major catastrophe.

Vernita: Acknowledge there are questions about flooding and ice jams, and may be tradeoffs with aesthetics.

Mark McCollister: These were concerns that were brought up, and will be addressed in design phase.

Francis: Forest Service thinks they know what happens when you do when you're suggesting, but we can't visualize that. So if you can help us understand what is going to happen when we move the water in that section, that would be better. We're focusing on that jam, but you have already thought that through; we just can't visualize.

Vernita: I can't quite visualize it either. That's a good point, that seeing more of a picture of what Bob and Allen are talking about would be helpful to understanding how the design addresses concerns about flooding. Let me talk about this with Bob and Allen during the break and see if they can find a way to address that today or at a future time. .

Allen: Because people have questions, we haven't adequately addressed this issue yet.

Vernita: We'll come back to this.

Bob: Page 7. Bear Creek coming in. Wetland area and side channel.

Allen: Transitioning from section by Galena where we're using a purposely light touch, targeted and strategic at where we propose actual action. This area is now transitioning more toward stage 0 of stream elevation. There are multiple ways to bring water table closer to the floodplain. Can raise the bed up, grade the floodplain down, or combination of these or other methods.

Bob: Transitioning those slopes together. This is the reach with the heavier aquatic objectives. The water table will be higher. County Road 20 goes through this way. Tailings would be preserved for existing vegetation, no grading.

Vito Mosso: How far is it from Galena first reach area, from here?

Bob: Scale on the bottom. Some overlap (about 400 feet).

Vito: On where you're going to put the berm: what kind of material?

Allen: Yet to dive into that. The engineering firm suggested using tailing material. There are areas of road susceptible to inundation. How would stakeholders feel about using the materials to berm that road?

Marcy: More concerned with flooding.

Vito: Just want to know what that material is going to be.

Allen: Talked about using cobbles and gravels.

A couple of things wanted to point out. Fish passage was one objective for this project. Wanted to maintain river channel near Deep Creek confluence and increase the length of time of the year when fish passage is facilitated through that. It currently goes dry during a portion of the summer. Still working with

design firm on a few issues, for example how Bear Creek comes into the Middle Fork (alluvial fan). The creek has been jumping around (that's what they do on fans, and can switch channels frequently). When we were out there last, the creek had flipped over to a channel that used to be dry by this time of year. Used to be a series of ponds. Now the switch has dried out those ponds, and the new pond is gigantic. Being maintained by subsurface flow from the Middle Fork, as well as Bear Creek.

Jim: Contribute that to Middle Fork or Bear Creek? So it's running?

Allen: Subsurface.

Bob: Some side channels. The others were dry.

Allen: The social objectives for this section included mitigating flooding and preserving some tailings for aesthetics, also to maintain the wetland. Worked all this into design. Any questions?

Mark McCollister: When on County Road 20, you will still see tailings to the right and left.

Billie Jo: What are you doing with Deep Creek channel?

Allen: At that confluence there would be one of the alcove features that will be backwatered for most of the year to increase fish passage. There is more design analysis to be done, but current analysis shows that the valley would be coming up about 0.2 feet.

Marcy: So you are raising the channel?

Mark McCollister: Yes, about 0.2 feet, or 3 inches.

Billie Jo: Not going to be moving the road? Was told during Big Mosquito you would be decommissioning the road.

Allen: Our intent is not to mess with where Deep Creek comes out. Can't change location because it has to go through a culvert under County Road 20.

Billie Jo: The Browns' house sits right there. They had huge concern is flooding with Deep Creek.

Bob: Saw that too. There have been rocks piled on the channel.

Allen: Quite a bit of fall in Deep Creek below their property. There is nothing we're proposing to do or could do that would have any effect on flooding on their property.

Francis: Visually. In all that area that's grey, we're going to move dirt around and do various things?

Allen: There are areas where we are not proposing to do any work, and instead preserve existing tailings and vegetation.

Marcy: Will it look like the Oxbow?

Allen: There are multiple channels across this floodplain.

Francis: But you're taking all of that gray area?

Allen: Cut and fill balance: take off the high points in some areas, and fill in low areas that are effecting where water moves across that surface. Design firm is telling us we've achieved a good balance. Wanted to minimize cost, by not having to haul materials off.

John Collins: Is whole tree placement the same as planting new trees? (Referencing legend.)

Allen: No. There are a variety of methods of taking whole trees with branches and rootwads and placing them in the channel and floodplain to accomplish very specific objectives, and those are shown in the legend. For planting, not exclusively cottonwood, alders, willows, and dogwoods. Project area historically had some large conifer (ponderosa pine).

Let's look at cross section.

Jim: Is there a reason you didn't put the channel on that side to keep the wetland wet?

Allen: Design firm analysis showed the channel in this location would be effective in retaining the wetland. We have more follow-up to do with them on this.

Jim: Elevation is higher where wetland is. Let's put some water out there, put new channel on the left side so it flows through it. Not below it. Take some survey points out there, it will show you.

Allen: There is a bit of channel near the toe slope.

Marcy: 40 and 50 years ago this was a hay meadow.

Jim: Always put a ditch in the lower side.

Allen: Input like that we can definitely incorporate.

Jim: Talked about retaining pond for the birds. If you put water above it will stay full. If you put it below it, it may not.

Vito: Putting these two maps together (7 and 8). Where will you start the floodplain?

Allen: Page 3 shows where the maps overlap.

Bob: So question is, at what station will we start regrading or narrowing the channel that will start having effects on water flow?

Vito: right, because there are no lines saying where all this is going to start.

Allen: The location where that might start is variable based on more modeling.

Vernita: Can we answer this on the break? Might need to do some looking at this.

Allen: Going to sheet 6, second transition to narrowing floodplain.

Bob: Talked about increasing sinuosity, or channels. One very large culturally significant feature in here.

Allen: Quite a bit of mature vegetation by the road. All that would remain. Design firm identified a few areas where it made sense to construct that berm to further protect County Road 20.

Shaun Doyle: Going to bring new soil in to hold vegetation?

Allen: Science indicates that success with planting vegetation is better if you are able to bring in fine soil where it is lacking. Some depends on existing condition. However, from some soil sampling in this area, once you get below that armor cobble layer there is already a lot of dirt. Even just raising the water a little

should get a positive response with vegetation. So maybe. Design isn't far enough along yet to know where to do that.

Marcy: So all of the part near the top will be filled so no chance of running back into old channel?

Allen: Going to use alcoves. Permeable water running through there, cooling water.

Marcy: Bringing the channel over, down from the road. Old stream going to backfill it in?

Jim: How much above level are you going to fill it?

Bob: Going to see that in next cross section.

Zane: Looking at maps, when that water slows down, it brings up the temperature of the water, doesn't it? When water isn't flowing free, temperature rises.

Bob: Yes, when you slow it down it can heat up.

Zane: When I was kid, you could go out at anytime, anywhere and catch a fish from 10 to 18 inches long. Lots of salmon. Every time the Forest Service messed with river, there was less and less fish. Twenty years ago they went and put a bunch of rocks in that channel for shade. All the rocks do is heat up water. There are already a lot of alcoves through all these tailings. Used to be able to catch all the fish you want. When you slow water down you'll have more heat, and never will have fish.

Kirk: Concern of ours too. We don't want a channel that's going to heat up the channel more. First the goal with this work is self-sustaining vegetation so there's trees that are providing shad.

Zane: With the tailings there is shading there. So why go through all of this when the main objective is to get more fish in that river, when all you're going to do is bring up water temperature with this project?

Marcy: Lots of fish killed in this river. We grew up there, and we know.

Allen: This question came up in the first meeting. We provided information on this subject then and at the second meeting, with handouts, and on website. Maybe we can discuss this with you after the meeting?

Zane: Mosquito Creek example. First major flood is going to wash top soil away.

Vernita: Hopefully the information provided will address your concern. Can also discuss after the meeting.

Bob: There is a lot of research on intensively managed watersheds. Fiber optics measures temperatures, and they are coming up with specific objectives to lower water temps.

Marcy: How many of you guys were raised in town?

Allen: Grew up in Mill City, Oregon.

Vernita: You are referencing personal experience and observation.

Marcy: Yes, my older brother worked on this. We have observed so much on this river and know what it does. We're trying to impart that information. Have a vast amount of knowledge at your fingertips to help you with this project.

Vernita: That is a huge part of why Allen and Bob wanted you to be part of this process. We are all learning a lot. Want to highlight that Allen and Bob just got this design recently, and already sent it back once. They wanted to be more prepared to present this, but that didn't work out. We are hearing your concerns though and we want to find a way to address them. We want to be able to get through the design today to get to next steps. We may pause here to take a break.

[Back from break.]

Want to hear the rest of the design before we move forward. Toward the end of the meeting we will come back and talk about scheduling a follow up meeting for flooding and other concerns. Will spend a bit of time toward the end of the meeting talking about opportunities to engage with design. There's a bit of wiggle room in design.

Bob: Going to transition to cross section. Through the middle of that section there is a big culturally significant area would be preserved. Will fill channel.

Jim: What do you propose to fill it with?

Bob: Material on site. Cobble, sand, and silt.

Allen: Next is sheet 5. Close to tying in bottom end of the project.

As you look at this, there is a culturally significant mine tailing to be preserved. Design team determined that it needed to be modified to meet project objectives. Right now the channel goes up alongside road, and there are spots where the river is eating away at foundation of the road. So the design will narrow channel out through here to get it away from road. Quite a bit of the vegetation that's there along County Road 20 will remain for aesthetic qualities.

Bob: Utilizing existing floodplains that are present that were utilized for alfalfa.

Allen: All we are proposing in that area is some riparian planting.

Now will look at cross section (handout page 5 of 10) narrow cross section, because of hillslope and road.

Next is sheet 4. The challenge with this part of the project is how it gets tied back in with existing river surfaces. So there were no culturally significant mine tailings in this particular area.

Bob: Objectives you see from aquatics being met are a more meandering channel, floodplain reconnection, and increased vegetation. Existing vegetation will be balanced with the regrading.

Cross section view presented.

Allen: This section of the project will need to be refined as we move forward. Need to match elevation to disperse energy.

Discussion and Feedback

Vernita: Sorry we weren't able to get this information to you sooner. A lot to look at here. Please continue to look at this and mull it over on your own time. Takes a while to orient.

Let's spend some time reflecting on what we heard here. Part of what is so hard, is that it's difficult to get a visual image about how this does or does not address concerns, such as flooding. Is there a better way to talk that through and help us understand?

Allen: For folks who are interested and still have questions about potential flooding issues, can we meet at another time to have a more in depth conversation.

Vernita: Something folks would be interested in? The team is committed to not causing more property damage. Can set up a meeting after this.

Heard folks voicing concerns with ecological issues and other issues. Trying to put all that in one design, and that's not easy.

Two processes moving forward: 1) follow-up meeting about flooding, and 2) discussion of wiggle room.

Allen: There is some room to take stakeholder feedback. At meeting 2 we solicited input on a large scale. Now we are looking for more fine scale input. If there are discrete areas you would like to see unaltered for aesthetics or personal reasons, please let us know. We will see if we can incorporate that into the design and still meet objectives. If we can't, we will get back to you and let you know why. Not talking about entire map, but smaller areas.

Would folks be interested in getting back to us within a week or a week and a half, once you've gotten a chance to look it over, then let us know?

Vernita: Specific areas? Or just anywhere?

Allen: Anywhere. More latitude in areas with green/gray hashmarks, but anywhere, and we will do our best to take that into account.

Vernita: For example, Jim's point about running the channels above the wetland/pond.

Jim: Ten years down the road I want to drive down the road and say, "We did a hell of a good job." That's going to take everyone's input. That's what needs to happen. *How* that happens, that's up to you guys. Forest Service needs to raise public perception. This is a good opportunity to raise that bar, and have people feel like the community and the agency did this together. Win, win.

Francis: Now that you have a design, what I'd like to see is a meeting at Galena that talks about what's going to happen where, until you get to the other side of the... or maybe down to the Brown's house. Might want to go clear to the end.

Bob: I'm game. I like Jim's idea.

Jim: Last time we met at Galena. There were several locals. Lots of confrontation because no one knew what's going on. Now it can be more open.

Zane/Marcy: Want the fish back.

Vernita: They are open to that idea

Jim: Got to take a broad approach. It's not 'me and I,' it's 'we.' Don't want one special interest to say we can't do it because of a sideboard. Need to do what needs to be done for the good of the site, to make it better.

Vernita: This was a draft design, and there is lots of wiggle room to continue this conversation. Follow up meeting with Forest Service and others to talk about this design related to flooding. Can also make this a field trip to get a better sense of the visualization. Hard to look at design. Also acknowledge that initially

after implementation the look is different right afterward than over time. Can talk about that during field trip also. Things change over time. Cumulative restoration.

Jim: Everyone at the table should realize that riparian areas are not critical, they are resilient. There is resilience out there. Can abuse it, but generally, it is resilient.

Vernita: Looking forward to continuing this conversation. The kind of feedback that Allen and Bob would like right now has a quick turnaround of a week, in order to keep flow of information going to the engineer team so we can meet the deadline for completing the design. So they need this one week from today.

Marcy: So one week and then field trip?

Vernita: Engineers need this information pretty quick. Two activities follow; a field trip and a meeting for flooding.

Jim: Can we combine field trip with meeting on Tuesday?

Vernita: Maybe what will happen is a scheduling opportunity (maybe a Doodle poll) moving forward. Now will have Don Hann come up to talk about Mitigation.

Mitigation Measures

Don: Next step as Forest Archeologist is meeting with State preservation office discussing what our mitigation options are. Working site record is that the site as a whole is eligible for listing (without this designation we'd be done already; they wouldn't care). If there is some level of impact on the site, the law calls for some kind of mitigation.

Say that the project is going to impact a certain percentage of the site, we need to mitigate. Features or characteristics of the site are 'contributing elements,' and those are what we are going to try to preserve. What was designated as 'culturally significant' were the best examples of what the tailings looked like right after the dredge mining took place. They showed specific patterning from dredge tailing.

What can be mitigation?

If we're going to impact a prehistoric site, we usually excavate the site to gather that historic information before the site is impacted

For dredge mining, excavation may not be as big a factor. Exception might be a homestead foundation related to the site.

Another option is interpretation. Maybe put some signs up, pictures or the dredge. Talk about who did it, how long it lasted, its history. Could have a trail, walking around the site.

Can also do offsite interpretation. Could put it on the computer, can make a story map or virtual tour.

Could also do offsite at Bates state park, talk about it there, and tie in with partners. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) can also come up with other ideas.

When we determine whether a site is eligible or not, we try to look at the context and the mining history in general. SHPO might ask for an academic report on the history of mining in Grant County, and decide what the context is there.

Allen: How close are we to having that?

Don: Have a lot of pieces of information. Collected some good data, but not put together in any format. Need to pay people to sit down and put that together; fairly large undertaking. The neat thing would be that we could use it for teaching history. We could also tie in other mining sites in other areas. Would be good to relate them in context rather than look at each thing in isolation.

Public education is a very important part of historic preservation, because we don't have heritage police issuing tickets for damaging sites. Educating folks helps protect them better.

What we want to do this coming month is set up a day to go over the preliminary design with SHPO lead and give him an idea of what I have. SHPO can help guide mitigation.

Is there anything we want to take off the table for mitigation? For example do we want to have a pull off on the road with a sign interpreting the history and preserved tailings? Possible to share local history with other folks.

Francis: I don't know what you're saving. Other than a few areas, we're destroying it all. I don't know what's being saved. I don't live in Galena, but they are private people and don't want to bring people there.

Don: Right. That's why I'm asking. I can take stuff off the table.

Marcy: I don't want anything there.

Zane: Don't want anything there. People can drive by and see.

Vito: Pull out would be waste, since it's no longer there.

Billie Jo: Destroying it. Why bother if it's already gone? Feels like you're just throwing us a bone, since there would only be a patch here, patch there, but you'd be taking the majority of it away.

Vernita: So I'm hearing people don't want a pull out. Also concerns with volume of regrading work being done as part of this project. Encourage people to look for that kind of stuff on field trip, get a better sense of that.

Don: Heard a very clear "No" on interpretive mitigation. To get back to the idea that we're not leaving enough there...I think there will be some things left that would be able to see and talk about.

Vernita: About the context document; folks have a lot of history in this area. People have a lot of information and personal experience. Could that be integrated into this document?

Don: Would go out to a contractor, but part of contract could be to go out and talk to local folks.

Vernita: If that was made available for the people of Galena, would that have interest?

Don: What about offsite mitigation? Online or somewhere else? The idea of talking about the history of the town or Galena in a bigger since.

Zane: Tie it to Bates.

Marcy: Yes, because the logs came down the river. I think that's a great idea.

Jim: Are there any other tailings anywhere else in the western United States?

Don: Yes, snooped around. Granite Creek has a whole dredge, and tailings preserved area around the dredge. There are some spots left, but it is getting rarer and rarer. That was the point the SHPO person brought up. Often these are on private land and they don't get any say.

Jim: Was private land. Does it deserve to be preserved?

Don: We've already said yes and submitted it as a culturally significant site. Nothing in the law says you have to preserve it. Just do mitigation. Leave parts of it (and I'm hearing from some folks we're not leaving enough), and when we do impact it, mitigate.

Francis: What I don't understand is, if it's a historical site, and it's been deemed to be eligible to placed on the register, how is it that then we simply have some flyover happen and only those areas were deemed to have value for saving? I don't know how the process went for identifying a historical site.

Vernita: Good point. May not have given this enough time at last meeting regarding surveys and process.

Don: So this is all run on Federal lands under the National Historic Preservation Act. We go out and look for site, features, and artifacts. And there are different criteria. Some are not eligible because site integrity no longer exists. In this case, there are places where the tailings were left behind. Other places where they look like they were leveled off or other impacts took place. So archeologists go out and look at evidence on the surface and make a determination of whether a site is eligible or not.

Vernita: See also handout Don brought last time.

Shaun: What would happen to an active mining claim if this entire site was registered as historical?

Don: Generally nothing if it was already there. If someone wants to come in or expand the size of the claim into an area, then there is no mechanism to say, "No that can't be done" but there is a mechanism for mitigation, and negotiations.

Shaun: So mining claim would be grandfathered in and you could still actively search?

Don: Need to research this.

Allen: Would be wise to have one of our mining specialists be involved in this conversation.

Shaun: There are a lot of laws in Oregon about metal detection. So if this is determined to be a historical site, is that option gone?

Don: Not sure.

Vernita: We need to convene with you and connect you with some of the folks who have the expertise to offer those answers.

What Don was hoping to do was convene with the citizens of Galena about mitigation options.

Don: Pretty sure I heard don't want onsite interpretation, so I won't bring that forward as an idea. Going to try to do represent your values, but you can also contact the state office yourself. If you have more questions for me feel free to talk to me, I'm in the John Day Forest Service office.

Vernita: Hope you understand things are not finished. There are other opportunities to shape the final product. Four different processes now with follow up meeting about mining. What we have is a draft

design, with some wiggle room. But there are already some conflicts. Final product is going to require some compromises. Not everyone is going to get everything they want.

It has been my goal to work with the Forest Service team to integrate stakeholder values. If you remember at the second meeting, Bob and Allen had 100 percent restoration dream, but they've since whittled away at that. Chances are, it doesn't look the way you would have liked it either, but hopefully it looks better to you than it did when we started.

Thank you for showing up and doing this hard work. It's not over yet. There are some key questions that need to be answered and these folks have committed to answering those for you.

Finally, has this process has been valuable to you? Has this process demonstrated a good faith value? Have they listened to you? Are your concerns to some degree integrated in this process? Do you feel like moving forward you will be able to work with them to finalize this design?

It was my goal from this process that you would be heard, and I would like to hear from you now.

John: I'm satisfied thus far. Good job of presenting everything. Not over til' it's over. I know now more than I did before.

Judy Kerr: Good step toward coordination. Would be nice if all process followed these steps. Hopes something like this happens more often in the future, with every project.

Jim: Just a little bit of common sense came into it. Baby steps. When its common sense against science, common sense will win every time. Down the road, if we can look back and say we did a good job, that is the best thing that would have happened. Commend those two guys again, and Dave. Good thing they are listening, please pass this on. It's what has to happen. These people sitting around the room, they have a stake in this. Those in the Forest Service may or may not be here in 5 years.

Marcy: I wish that we would have had something like this with previous projects. Wish we could have been involved in what went on at Oxbow. Being involved in this is great. Hope that there is value taken from us because we're 5-6 generations of living on the Middle Fork, and have a wealth of knowledge, and trial of error and experience passed down. Appreciate being included in this process. Hope that our concerns about flooding and history are included. We want fish. Its' a big job; thank you for including us.

Billie Jo: This was a huge step between the Forest Service and public. Bob and Allen have done a great job for bringing this group together. Before it was unheard of. And it's amazing what's gone on here.

Vernita: Want to emphasis this wouldn't happen if you weren't each sitting in the room. And remember, this isn't done yet. In order to look back and say this was a great project, need to follow up and continue partnering with these folks as they roll this out.

Francis: From the beginning I've been grateful for Vernita as facilitator, and the others of the team. All of the meetings have been outstanding. Dialogue has been great. People have been respectful.

The design scares me. Because I'm not sure we were heard. That's why I need to know more about, when I stand in the street of Galena, and these gentleman tell me where those ebbs and flows are going to be.

Vernita: This is reasonable. This is why we want to talk through the design and how it addressed those concerns. They are committed to that. I am confident that these folks will work with you and you will feel heard. Also happy knowing you will show up and have that conversation. Thank you for being honest.

Thank you all for that feedback

Would like to close with clarity regarding how project will move forward.

Next steps and expectations

Mark McCollister: Conceptual design drawing is what you have in hand. Now will go through 3 to 4 substantial iterations before achieving a 75 percent design. At that point, we will solicit peer review independent of the design team. Will also check in with you guys about flooding. Then 75 percent design can be to funders and permitting agencies by the end of the year. Next year will try to fund and implement project.

Jim: Any part of this that goes through the [Blue Mountain Forest Partners] collaborative?

Allen: Briefed collaborative members in June. Mark Webb attended first meeting, hasn't been able to attend the others. Part of communication plan is to brief the collaborative at the conclusion of these three meetings.

Jim: Zones of agreement (ZOA) of riparian areas. If we go through this whole process then goes through the collaborative process, is it all for naught?

Bob: No, not for naught. Won't get changed.

Allen: Typically the ZOA apply to large landscape restoration, actions that are applied consistently at broad scales. This is fairly unique situation.

Billie Jo: If this is done under Aquatic Restoration EA, doesn't need to go through the collaborative, correct?

Bob: Correct. Thought we brought collaborative group out to the site in 2013, and this is what triggered us started to see this project in the social context. Larry Blasing pointed out the potential conflicts of the aquatic restoration project with social values of the area.

Allen: This is where the need to include landowners and other stakeholders in this project was identified.

Jim: This is a much better process.

Vernita: So to recap, implementation sounds like it will be in 2019 to 2021. This is last meeting I'll be involved in facilitating. However, there will be other opportunities to communicate. If there is a big change, these folks will get back to you via email and the website. Take the initiative to check in and see what's going on.

They will hold final meetings and finalize this design. Stay in touch.

Anything else?

Allen: Once we reach key milestones we'll be sharing that with the public through press releases and website.

Vernita: So it's not done. I'll be checking in also to see where this goes. Thanks to everyone for their time and dedication.